

REMARKS

A number of claims were either objected to for typographical errors or rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph and second paragraph. Accordingly, the claims objected to or rejected have been amended in such a way that the Applicant believes addresses the Examiner's objections and rejections thereof.

Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected a number of claims as being unpatentable for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 over U.S. Patent 6,490,324 issued to McDade that describes a "system, method and an apparatus for a digital video decoder..." at Abstract. The Examiner states at page 6, second paragraph of the Office Action dated November 21, 2003, that "McDade does not explicitly disclose enhancing the selected digital video frame based upon information included in the other digital video frames and the particular digital video frame. Instead, McDade discloses decompressing the encoded frames based upon the information of the frames (col. 13, lines 5 – 40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art...to have modified McDade to include enhancing the selected digital video frame...since decompressing the encoded video frames is one way to enhance a video frame...". Therefore, in order to support the obviousness rejection of claim 21, the Examiner believes that decompressing a digital video frame is the same as enhancing a digital video frame, a belief with which the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. The Applicant contends that the acts of decompressing a digital video frame and enhancing a digital video frame are not the same but are in fact separate and distinct operations, unrelated to one another. For example, a digital video frame (if compressed) can be decompressed without it being enhanced (and vice versa) since the act of decompressing a digital video frame does nothing to "enhance" the digital video frame.

In particular, as described on page 8 last paragraph of the Specification, the compressed video stream is **decompressed into a series of digital video frames**. It is selected ones of these already decompressed digital video frames that are subject to being enhanced, since only after the

compression operations are complete, can the enhancement operation continue (at page 9, second paragraph).

Accordingly, independent claim 21 discloses a method of enhancing selected digital video frames included in a digital video stream that recites at least the following operations,

“selecting a particular one of the digital video frames for enhancement;
selecting others of the digital video frames associated with the digital video frame to be enhanced; and
enhancing the selected digital video frame based upon information included in the other digital video frames and the particular digital video frame.”

The Applicant believes that the cited reference does not suggest the invention as recited in claim 21.

Independent claims 28 and 35 recite essentially the same limitations as claim 21 albeit in terms of computer program product and an apparatus that are nonetheless also allowable over the cited art.

All dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from claims 21 or 28 or 35 and are also allowable for at least the reasons stated for the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300